



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

---

THE EMPIRE OF THE HITTITES.—By William Wright, B. A., D. D. With Decipherment of Hittite Inscriptions by Prof. A. H. Sayce, LL.D. A Hittite Map by Col. Sir Charles Wilson, F. R. S., &c., and Capt. Conder, R. E. And a complete set of Hittite Inscriptions revised by Mr. W. H. Rylands, F. S. A. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1884. [pp. xxii, 200, and 21 pages of plates].

Two different classes of readers might be kept in view by one who should write a book about the ancient Hittites; archæologists and special students of ancient history, on the one hand, and, on the other, the great body of educated people, who are glad to know the results of special investigations. Interest in the advance of knowledge, and a desire for a wide horizon of thought stimulate some members of the latter class, but the eagerness is greatest whenever the matter is one which relates in any way to practical affairs, especially if it touches, or is supposed to touch, the religious beliefs of any great body of persons. This has been repeatedly illustrated within the past decade or so, and a considerable body of literature has sprung up to meet the demand which comes from just these persons.

Dr. Wright is better fitted by mental equipment and habit to interest the latter class than to instruct the small but exacting body of special scholars. His book opens a new and attractive field to the general reader, and will be welcome to those who are concerned for the historical accuracy of the Old Testament. Everything now known tends to show that there was once a large and formidable population between the Middle Euphrates and the Orontes, that there was some kind of national organization, that it was this organized people which the Assyrians called Chatti, and the Egyptians Kheta, and that the "Chittites"—A. V. Hittites—of the Old Testament present the same name in a very slightly modified form. The presumption is, therefore, strong that the inscribed stones found in considerable numbers in the region where this people dwelt are traces of their civilization, and that monuments with similar features found along certain thoroughfares of Asia Minor indicate an extension (whether brief or long-

continued) of the influence and power of this people to the shores of the Ægean. All this is presented in Dr. Wright's book, and he appends numerous plates which give a good idea of the general characteristics and many of the more minute details of the monumental remains.

Add to this that the book is well printed and has a striking cover.

Scientific students will, however, find themselves obliged to wait for some further work, by a trained hand, which shall meet their reasonable demands. From a scholarly standpoint the following defects may be remarked :

1. Dr. Wright does not give an adequate history of the explorations and studies which bear upon the subject of which he treats. For example, he dwells upon the casts taken in Hamah by himself and Mr. Kirby Green, but ignores the casts and squeezes made by Prof. Paine and Lieut. Steever in Beirut, where the stones tarried on the way to Constantinople. In regard to the publication of fac-similes his account is still more defective. The place of honor here belongs to Dr. W. H. Ward (*Am. Pal. Expl. Soc., Second Statement, Sept., 1873*), who made use of the impressions secured by Steever and Paine, and produced plates of remarkable accuracy and of large size. But Dr. Ward's name does not occur, though we have both Johnson and Burton. Scattered through the book are references to various explorers, and extracts from their descriptions and opinions, but with a lack of precision as to date and care in arrangement which render them all but valueless for purposes of scientific study.

2. His account of the monuments themselves is insufficient. True, he gives us, thanks to the care of Mr. W. H. Rylands, an excellent set of plates, but these plates do not cover the whole ground. The reliefs of Boghaz Keui, for example, and of Eyuk, which are several times referred to, and with which, even, certain features of the plates given are compared (*e. g.*, p. 145), are nowhere described, except in the most incidental and superficial way. If it was not possible to present reduced copies of the plates of Texier or Perrot—although one does not see any insuperable difficulty in the way—a precise account of these, at least, is indispensable to the student. No one who has not seen the French plates could get from Dr. Wright's allusions a remote conception of the extent and nature of the sculptures at those points. But these are quite as important as the sculptures of Karabel—and in most respects far more so—in determining the relation of the civilization which produced these works to that of Hamah, Aleppo and Jerabis.

3. The author has no adequate conception of scientific proof. The dictum of any scholar seems to meet the requirements of his argument, provided it is available for the point he desires to make. He culls from Brugsch, when Brugsch says the Kheta were once settled near Egypt (pp.

14, 47), regardless of Maspéro, and from Mariette, when Mariette conjectures that Hittites were among the Hyksos (pp. 47, 48), regardless of the lack of any exact knowledge about the origin of the Hyksos. Whatever Professor Sayce has said is accepted as final. A critical examination of opinions is not entered upon, nor are the matters to be proved stated clearly and in an orderly manner. There is no steady progress in the book, and it is much marred and weakened by repetitions.

4. There is quite too much of the apologetic temper—of eagerness to claim everything that may seem to confirm Bible narratives. We are the more free to say this because Dr. Wright's conclusions with reference to the Old Testament Hittites are for the most part susceptible of scientific statement and of strong defence. In his very eagerness to insist upon them he has failed to allow them their full impression.

5 It is a grave defect from the scholarly standpoint that the references are so imperfectly given—in some cases an author is cited (as in the case of Mariette on the Hyksos, mentioned above) without any reference whatever to the source of the citation.

6 We note a few details which are open to criticism. It is quite likely that the "poem of Pentaur" (p. 21, sq.) was not composed by Pentaur (see Erman, *Neuägyptische Gram.*, 1880, p. 7; Wiedemann, *Aegyptische Geschichte*, II, 1884, p. 434 N.); the assertion (p. 47)—"It would thus appear that as the Hittites bore down upon Egypt from the North they occupied the fertile plain of Mamre, and built Hebron seven years before they had secured sufficient foothold in Egypt to found their capital city Zoan"—is based not only on the unproven hypothesis that the Hyksos were Hittites, but upon the farther assumption that the Hittites built Hebron; the interpretation of Ezek. xvi, 3 (pp. 48, 111, sq.)—"There is little doubt that the reference here is to the Hittite origin and occupation of Jerusalem"—is groundless, the expressions of that verse being figurative; that "Tahtim-hodshi" of 2 Sam., xxiv, 6 is a corruption (p. 50), is doubtless correct, the probable reading, however, would give, not "to the land of the Hittites of Kadesh," but, "to the land of the Hittites, to Kadesh," and that this result is due to "a careful examination of the best Hebrew manuscripts" is news, indeed, and very encouraging to textual critics of the Old Testament, who will hope for more exact information from Dr. Wright as to where these excellent manuscripts are to be found; Hitzig, it seems, and Thenius, and Wellhausen were ignorant of them! Kadesh-on-the-Orontes is assumed to be Tel-Neby-Mendeh (p. 52, etc.), (so Conder, *e. g.*, *Heth and Moab*, 1883, p. 28 sq.; but see H. G. Tomkins, *Pal. Expl. Fund.*, Quart. Statement, Jan., 1882, and T. S. B. A. VII, 3, 1882). The view may be correct, but the considerations proposed by Tomkins have great weight, and are by no means to be simply

ignored. Then we have bold assertions like these: "There can be little doubt that the Lycaonian *patois*, which continued to be the vernacular of the people till the days of Paul, was Hittite" (!—p. 56); "we know from the inscription on the Ibreez bas-relief that the language of Ibreez was Hittite" (!—p. 57), etc. Further: "The Hittites, like the Canaanites, imported their gods and goddesses from Babylonia" (p. 73); this is unproven; so is Mr. Gladstone's ingenious suggestion, adopted by Dr. Isaac Taylor and Dr. Wright (pp. 7, 70, 126), that the Keteioi of Homer (Odys. xi, 521) are the Hittites; so is the presence of the "Dardanians" in the Hittite army under Kheta-sar, in the war with Rameses II (pp. 22, 53, 59; cf. Wiedemann, *l. c.* p. 436); and so one might go on.

No reference has here been made to the attempts of Professor Sayce to decipher the Hittite inscriptions; a chapter of the book is devoted to this, but even if there were more fresh material in it than is actually the case, we cannot think that the time has yet come for any profitable publication of the guesses of a decipherer with reference to the values of these obscure characters. There is, indeed, no sufficient reason for questioning the genuineness of the bilingual "Boss of Tarkondêmos," but the structure erected upon the supposed interpretation of the non-cuneiform character of this little plate is very insecure.

FRANCIS BROWN.

MANUEL DE PHILOGIE CLASSIQUE. — Par Salomon Reinach, Agrégé de l'Université, Ancien Membre de l'École Française d'Athènes. Tome Second. Appendice. Paris, 1884. pp. xvi, 310.

Few books of scholarship prove their usefulness and attain reputation so rapidly as the first volume of M. Reinach's *Manuel*. Published originally in 1880, it appeared in a revised and improved edition in 1883. The work is now completed by the second volume, which to the advanced student is of even more interest and value than the first. It gives evidence of the worth of the author's practical experience in archæological investigations during the past four or five years as a supplement to his chamber studies. His judgment has matured in proportion to the increase of his learning.

M. Reinach defines classical philology as "the science of the intellectual life of the ancients, and particularly of the Romans and the Greeks . . . whose literature, philosophy and art are the ever-living sources of modern culture." The object of his book is two-fold; — to present concisely the results already obtained in this science, and to afford ample and exact information concerning the chief authorities in each main division